

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodersen in view of Raz. Applicants disagree and offer the following arguments.

In the Decision on Appeal dated 12/17/2008, the Board found (page 11) that each of the plurality of databases of Brodersen has an agent or program with which it is associated to perform the respective functions. The Board gave the claim term "having" a meaning of "being associated with," and rejected Appellants' argument that "having" means "included in" or "being a part of."

Applicants subsequently amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 in response to the Appeal Decision to specifically require the respective agent to be included in each of said processing databases, a recitation fully supported by Applicants' specification. Such amending has overcome the Board's interpretation of the claim term "having" to mean "being associated with." Brodersen's agent or program may be associated with the database, but it is not described as included in the database.

The Examiner states in his response to arguments of 03/03/2009 that the amended claims would have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Brodersen in view of Raz. Applicants disagree. First of all Brodersen does not describe, but merely suggests that each of the plurality of databases has an agent because a skilled artisan would understand that an "agent" associated with

the databases performs certain functions. The Board did not find that the skilled artisan would also know that the agent must be included in the database and in fact had to interpret Applicants' "having" claim term to mean "associated with" in order to find obviousness. Applicants' amended claims are therefore not obvious, otherwise the Board would not need to interpret "having" as "associated with." Applicants' independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are allowable for this reason alone.

In the previous amendment, Applicants have also amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to require the key and detail to be included within each of the one or more transactions. The Examiner cited Brodersen's writing a transaction log to nodes. The Board agreed that the combined teachings of Brodersen and Raz would disclose or at least suggest updating a record in said second of said plurality of processing databases by using said key and detail. The Board also found that the skilled artisan would have understood that the key and detail included in the databases in Brodersen are used in the updating of the databases. However, claims 1, 8, and 15 now require that there be a key and detail included in each transaction. The combination of Brodersen and Raz does not teach or suggest this requirement. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are therefore also allowable for this reason alone.

Finally, Applicants also amended claims 1, 8, and 15 in their previous amendment to require that the plurality of processing databases be a plurality of types which must include at least one relational database and one sequential database and

one spreadsheet database. Such amending specifically clarifies the meaning of database types and overcomes any previous citations that Brodersen and Raz describes or suggests a plurality of processing database types. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are thus allowable for this reason alone.

In light of the arguments above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and allowance of all of the pending claims.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 05/29/2009 By: /John Pivnichny/

John R. Pivnichny

Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607) 429-4358

Fax: (607) 429-4119